

### **III. REMARKS**

Applicant has considered the current Office Action with mailing date of September 18, 2007. Claims 1 - 17 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6, 10 and 14 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are rejected as allegedly being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. Claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Beadle et al. (US Pat. No. 6,766,373), hereinafter "Beadle". Claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (APPA) in view of Beadle and Tyrell, III (US Pate. No. 7,062,527), hereinafter "Tyrell". Applicant submits the following arguments in support of current amendments in the claims for the Office's consideration.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-5 and 10-17, under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as allegedly being indefinite, Applicant has amended the claim which now recites, *inter alia*, "...wherein the adding is performed through a separate web application having a sole duty to serve the resource." As such, it is clear that the separate web application cannot be the same web

applications referred to earlier in the claims because this separate web application's sole duty is to serve the resource. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6-8, Applicants submit that AAPA and Beadle do not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. As a first matter, Applicant disputes that Paragraph [0002] (cited by the Office as Admitted Prior Art) of the claimed invention discloses any element of the claimed invention. In fact, the Office admits that the primary reference, AAPA, does not explicitly teach that the dynamically adding of a resource occurs without losing session information, or that the adding is performed through a separate web application having a sole duty to serve the resource. Instead, the Office alleges that Beadle teaches a system that allows users to be switched over to other connections without losing session information. Even if, *arguendo*, Beadle did, in fact, teach what the Office alleges, the Office has still not shown that Beadle teaches each and every claim limitation of the claimed invention. Although Beadle does teach that it is beneficial to avoid losing session information, the system taught in Beadle to achieve that end is not equivalent to the claimed invention. For example, Beadle does not teach "wherein the adding is performed through a separate web application having a sole duty to serve the JAVA resources."

The Office, in the Response to Arguments section, states that "Beadle was cited to indicate that it is well known in the art that losing session information is highly unwanted behavior." Office Action, p. 6. While Applicants may agree with the Office that it is well known in the art that losing session information is not desired, Applicants respectfully submits that prior art that states that a problem exists is not equivalent to prior art that discloses the

solution of the claimed invention. For example, Beadle teaches a system that allows a client browser to switch from one connection route to another route without losing session information, by storing/caching the session information on the client and the server. In contrast, the claimed invention solves the problem in a different way, teaching that Java resources are obtained indirectly from a separate web application, whose only duty is to serve Java resources. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection based on AAPA and Beadle.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-5 and 9-17, Applicants submit that, as discussed above, AAPA and Beadle do not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. In addition, Tyrell does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Beadle. Neither of the three references, singly or in combination, teach the limitation, present in all independent claims, that Java resources are obtained indirectly from a separate web application, whose only duty is to serve Java resources. Since the Office is unable to find pertinent references as prior art that teaches the claimed features, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, Applicant respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow the claims.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's

combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Q. Toner  
Meghan Q. Toner  
Reg. No. 52,142

Dated: December 18, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14 Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
Telephone: (518) 449-0044  
Fax: (518) 449-0047